

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 20, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-14 and 16-25 are pending. Claims 2, 5, 8 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 14 and 16-23 have been amended. New claims 24-25 have been added, support for which can be found in the instant specification, among other places, at paragraph [0022] and FIGS. 2a-2b.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) on the grounds that they were considered to be anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,724,492 to Matthews, III et al. ("Matthews"). For the reasons presented below, it is respectfully submitted that Matthews does not anticipate the subject matter recited in these claims.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for providing an aesthetically pleasing transition between two or more menu bars that includes, among other features, "detecting a change between active applications running on a computer from a first application having a first menu bar currently displayed to a second application having a second menu bar to be displayed," and "providing visual notification of the change between active applications by rendering animation graphics to animate a transition between the first and second menu bars such that differences between the first menu bar and the second menu bar are apparent." For example, as described in the specification of the instant application, in one embodiment, a menu bar associated with an application undergoes an animated transition when the menu bar of another

application becomes active to provide a user with visual notification that the menu bar options have changed. (See, Specification at paragraphs [0007]-[0009]). These techniques can be particularly useful in an environment where multiple applications are running on a computer to aid a user in recognizing that new choices within the menu bar have been presented. (See, Specification at paragraph [0006]).

Matthews, on the other hand, describes using a three-dimensional menu object having more than one panel to conserve display space in environments such as hand held computers and interactive TV. (See, Matthews at col. 18, lines 9-11, col. 13, lines 34-37, FIGS. 11-12). Matthews describes integrating a variety of information on the three-dimensional menu object, including menu items associated with any program that runs on the hand held computer, where a user can navigate the integrated menu object using a stylus. (See, Matthews at col. 18, lines 2-8 and 36-38). Thus, while Matthews describes an approach for conserving display space by using an integrated menu object of items associated with different program modules running on the hand held computer, nowhere does Matthews describe "detecting a change between active applications running on a computer from a first application having a first menu bar currently displayed to a second application having a second menu bar to be displayed," as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, while Matthews describes providing animated three-dimensional images during the integrated menu object's open, close and panel transitions to indicate to a user the presence of other panels, and providing animated three-dimensional images during panel-to-panel transitions to convince the user that the menu object is a three-dimensional representation, nowhere does Matthews describe "providing visual notification of the change between active applications by

rendering animation graphics to animate a transition between the first and second menu bars such that differences between the first menu bar and the second menu bar are apparent," as recited in claim 1. (See, Matthews at col. 18, lines 10-18 and 36-40, and FIGS. 11-12).

For at least these reasons, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Matthews does not anticipate the subject matter of independent claim 1 and claims 3-4, 6-7 and 9-13, which depend therefrom. Likewise, for reasons analogous to those presented for claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Matthews does not anticipate the subject matter of independent claims 14 and 23, and claims 16-22, which depend therefrom. New dependent claims 24-25 have been added. For reasons analogous to those presented for claims 1 and 14, it is respectfully submitted that Matthews does not anticipate the subject matter of new claims 24-25, which depend therefrom, respectively.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: July 20, 2006

By: Nicole D. Dretar
Nicole D. Dretar
Registration No. 54,076

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620